Heegaard Diagrams of S^3 and the Andrews-Curtis Conjecture

Guangyuan Guo

arXiv:1601.06871v1 [math.GT] 26 Jan 2016

Abstract. *We show that the Andrews-Curtis conjecture holds for all balanced presentations of the trivial group corresponding to Heegaard diagrams of S^3*

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 57Mxx, 20Exx, 20Fxx.

Key words and phrases: Heegaard diagram, free group, balanced presentation, trivial group, Andrews-Curtis conjecture.

1. Introduction

In this note, all manifolds are assumed to be orientable p.l. manifolds and maps piecewise linear. If G is a group and $g_1, \cdots, g_k$ are elements of G, then $(g_1, \cdots, g_k)$ and $\langle g_1, \cdots, g_k\rangle$ will denote respectively the subgroup of G generated by $g_1, \cdots, g_k$ and the smallest normal subgroup of G containing $g_1, \cdots, g_k$. A set $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$ of n mutually disjoint simple closed curves on a closed surface S of genus n such that $S - \cup_i r_i$ is connected will be called a **complete system** on S [8]. A **Heegaard diagram** is a 3-dimensional handlebody together with a complete system on its boundary (our definition of a Heegaard diagram here is equivalent but slightly different from that in some other papers, e.g. [8]).

Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer and V be a 3-dimensional handlebody of genus n. **A section of** V (also called a complete system of meridian discs [6] or a cut [12]) is a set $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ of n mutually disjoint discs in V such that $\partial d_i = d_i \cap \partial V$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, and that $V - \cup_i d_i$ is connected. It is known that any section of V can be obtained from any other one by a finite number of operations which we call **replacements** (definition in section 2) in this note. This fact gives a coarse relation between different Heegaard diagrams associated with a Heegaard splitting, since each such diagram corresponds to a section of a handlebody of the splitting. We observe that the operations above can be reduced to more elementary ones called **elementary replacements**. This gives a more precise and tractable way to relate different Heegaard diagrams associated with any given Heegaard splitting of a closed orientable 3-manifold. It also enables us to define some equivalence relation in the set of all complete systems on the boundary of a handlebody. The set of equivalence classes of Heegaard splittings of genus g are then in one-to-one correspondence with the set of equivalence classes of complete systems on the boundary of a handlebody of genus g. And in particular, it provides a way to study all Heegaard diagrams of S^3, since there

is only one Heegaard splitting of S^3 of genus n up to equivalence, by a theorem of Waldhausen [10]. By examining the effect of each elementary replacement on the elements of $\pi_1(V)$ represented by the boundary curves of the discs in the sections of the complimentary handlebody in S^3, we show that the Andrews-Curtis conjecture holds for all balanced presentations of the trivial group corresponding to Heegaard diagrams of S^3.

Acknowledgement The work in this note was done while the author was holding positions at Nanchang University and the Central University of Finance and Economics. I thank both Universities for their hospitality and generous financial support.

2. Sections of a Handlebody

Let V be a 3-dimensional handlebody of genus n and $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_k\}$ be a set of k mutually disjoint discs in V such that $\partial d_i = d_i \cap \partial V$, $i = 1, \cdots, k$. By **cutting** V **along** D (see [3]) we mean removing the interior of a regular neighborhood $N(d_i)$ of each d_i, $i = 1, \cdots, k$, from S, where the $N(d_i)$'s are always chosen to be mutually disjoint. We will denote the result of cutting V along D by V_D. $V_{\{d_1\}}$ will simply be denoted by V_{d_1}. V_D is a subset of V and closed subsets of V that do not intersect the d_i's can also be considered as subsets of V_D. If $k \leq n$ and $V - \cup_i d_i$ is connected, then V_D is a handlebody of genus $n - k$. For each $i = 1, \cdots, k$, there are two obvious copies of d_i on the boundary of V_D. Denote one copy by d^+, and the other by d^-.

Given a section $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ of V, the set of simple closed curves $\{\partial d_1, \cdots, \partial d_n\}$ on ∂V is called the **trace** of the section D [12]. Clearly, the trace of a section of V is a complete system on ∂V.

Now let $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ be a section of V and let d_1' be a disc in V such that $\partial d_1' = \partial V \cap d_1'$, $d_1' \cap d_i = \emptyset$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, and $V - d_1'$ is connected. On the surface of V_D, there are n pairs $d_i^{\pm}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, of discs corresponding to the discs in D. Since V_D is a 3-cell, it is decomposed into two parts, each of which is a 3-cell, by d_1'. So $(V_D)_{d_1'}$ is the union of two disjoint 3-cells. If for some i, d_i^+ and d_i^{-1} are in separate parts, then we say that d_1' separates the pair $d_i^{\pm}$. Since $V - d_1'$ is connected, d_1' must separate some pair $d_i^{\pm}$, $d_1^{\pm}$ say, and we can replace d_1 in D by d_1' to get a new section $D' = \{d_1', d_2, \cdots, d_n\}$ of V. We call such a process of getting a section D' of V from a given one D a **replacement**. If moreover, d_1' separates exactly two pairs and there are only two of the $d_i^{\pm}$'s, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, in one part of $(V_D)_{d_1'}$, then the replacement is called an **elementary replacement**.

Definition 2.1. *Two sections D_1 and D_2 of a handlebody V are said to be equivalent, and written $D_1 \sim D_2$, if D_2 can be obtained from D_1 by a finite number of elementary replacements.*

" $\sim$ " is obviously an equivalence relation in the set of all sections of V. So the set of all sections of V are divided into equivalence classes. The following result says

that there is only one equivalence class of sections for any given handlebody.

Theorem 2.2. *Let V be a 3-dimensional handlebody and $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ and $D' = \{d'_1, \cdots, d'_n\}$ be two sections of V. Then D' can be obtained from D by a finite number of elementary replacements.*

Proof. Theorem 2.2 is a refinement of Theorem 2.3 next, using Lemma 2.4 that follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let V, D and D' be as in Theorem 3.2. Then D' can be obtained from D by a finite number of replacements.*

Proof. This is a known result. See, for example, Theorem 1 in [9].

Lemma 2.4. *Let V, $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ be as above. Let $D' = \{d'_1, d_2, \cdots, d_n\}$ be a section of V obtained from D by one replacement (replacing d_1 by d'_1). Then D' can be obtained from D by at most $n-1$ elementary replacements.*

Proof. d'_1 separates V_D into two parts, and by the assumption, d_1^+ and d_1^- lie in separate parts. Take a part that contains no more $d_i^\pm$'s, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, than the other part does and denote its closure by P_1. P_1 contains exactly one of $d_1^\pm$, d_1^+ say, and a copy of d'_1 which we still denote by d'_1. If P_1 contains no other $d_i^\pm$, $2 \le i \le n$, then d'_1 is isotopic to d_1 in V. In this case D and D' are the same, up to isotopy, and no elementary replacement is needed. If P_1 contains exactly one other $d_i^\pm, 2 \le i \le n$, then the replacement of d_1 by d'_1 is elementary.

In general, suppose that P_1 contains a total of m $d_i^\pm$'s, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. By our choice of P_1, $1 \le m \le n$. Choose m mutually disjoint discs $\bar{d}_1 = d_1^+, \bar{d}_2, \cdots, \bar{d}_{m-1}, \bar{d}_m = d'_1$ in P_1 such that $\partial \bar{d}_j = \bar{d}_j \cap \partial P_1, \bar{d}_j \cap d_i^\pm = \emptyset, 1 \le i \le n, 2 \le j \le m-1$, and that for each j, $2 \le j \le m-1$, $\bar{d}_1, \cdots, \bar{d}_{j-1}$ lie in the same side of $\bar{d}_j$ in P_1 ($\bar{d}_j$ decomposes P_1 into two parts) and the side contains exactly j $d_i^\pm$'s. $\bar{d}_2, \cdots, \bar{d}_{m-1}$ are also discs in V. Identify $\bar{d}_1$ with d_1 and $\bar{d}_m$ with d'_1 in V. Then all $\bar{d}_1, \cdots, \bar{d}_m$ are discs in V. Let $\bar{D}_j = \{\bar{d}_j, d_2, \cdots, d_n\}$, $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Each $\bar{D}_j$ is a section of V, $\bar{D}_1 = D, \bar{D}_m = D'$ and $\bar{D}_j$, $j = 2, \cdots, m$, is obtained from $\bar{D}_{j-1}$ by replacing $\bar{d}_{j-1}$ by $\bar{d}_j$ which is an elementary replacement. Thus we obtain $D' = \bar{D}_m$ from $D = \bar{D}_1$ by $m - 1 \le n - 1$ elementary replacements. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4 and also the proof of Theorem 2.2.

If (U, V) is a Heegaard splitting of a closed 3-manifold M and $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ is a section of U, then (R, V), where $R = \{\partial d_1, \cdots, \partial d_n\}$, is a Heegaard diagram for M. (R, V) is said to be a Heegaard diagram associated with the Heegaard splitting (U, V). The set of all Heegaard diagrams associated with the splitting (U, V) corresponds to the set of all sections of U. By Theorem 2.2, any section of U can be obtained from any other section of U by a finite number of elementary replacements. Therefore any two Heegaard diagrams associated with the splitting (U, V) are related through their corresponding sections. This gives a way to study the relation between different Heegaard diagrams of a Heegaard splitting.

Consider the set $\mathcal{C}$ of all complete systems on the boundary ∂V of the handlebody V. Define two types of operations on elements of $\mathcal{C}$:

(1) $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_{i-1}, r_i, r_{i+1}, \cdots, r_n\} \to \tilde{R} = \{r_1, \cdots, r_{i-1}, \tilde{r}_i, r_{i+1}, \cdots, r_n\}$, where $\tilde{r}_i$ is a simple closed curve obtained by sliding an r_j, $i \neq j$, over r_i along a simple curve c joining r_i and r_j such that the interior of c does not meet any of the r_i's.

(2) $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\} \to h(R) = \{h(r_1), \cdots, h(r_n)\}$, where h is a homeomorphism of V onto itself;

Now define an equivalence relation in $\mathcal{C}$ as follows. Two elements R and $\tilde{R}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ are said to be equivalent if R can be obtained from R' by a finite number of operations of types (1) and (2) above. One can easily check that this is indeed an equivalence relation in $\mathcal{C}$. Since an elementary replacement on the sections of a handlebody corresponds to an operation of type (1) on the traces of the sections, it is easy to see that Theorem 2.2 implies

Theorem 2.5. *Two Heegaard diagrams (R, V) and (R', V) are associated with equivalent Heegaard splittings if and only if R and R' are equivalent in $\mathcal{C}$. Consequently, the equivalence classes of Heegaard splittings of genus n of closed 3-manifolds are in one-to-one correspondence with the equivalence classes of complete systems on the boundary of a handlebody of genus n.*

3. Heegaard Diagrams of S^3 and the Andrews-Curtis Conjecture

By a theorem of Waldhausen [10], for each integer $n \geq 0$ there is only one Heegaard splitting for S^3 of genus n up to equivalence, therefore the result in the last section gives in particular an effective way to investigate all Heegaard diagrams of S^3. We look at this more closely.

For each $n \geq 0$, there is a canonical Heegaard diagram (C, W), $C = \{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$, of genus n for the 3-sphere S^3. The diagram is characterized by the property that there is a section $E = \{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ of W such that $c_i \cap \partial e_j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, is exactly one point if $i = j$ and empty if $i \neq j$. Let (R, V) be any Heegaard diagram of S^3. Consider the Heegaard splittings $(cl(S^3 - V), V)$ and $(cl(S^3 - W), W)$ of S^3 associated with the diagrams (R, V) and (C, W). By Waldhausen's theorem [10], there is a homeomorphism $h : S^3 \to S^3$ such that $h(V) = W$ and $h(cl(S^3 - V)) = cl(S^3 - W)$. Using h we identify V with W, which we denote by V, and $cl(S^3 - V)$ with $cl(S^3 - W)$, which we denote by U. Then there are two sections D_R and D_C of U, corresponding to R and C on $U \cap V$ respectively. By Theorem 2.2, D_R can be obtained from D_C by a finite number of elementary replacements. Therefore by starting from the canonical diagram (C, V) and studying the effect of each elementary replacement on the traces of the sections, one can hope to understand all Heegaard diagrams of S^3.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (U, V) be a Heegaard splitting of a closed 3-manifold. Let D' be a section of U obtained from another section D of U by an elementary replacement,*

then the set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by the trace of D' may be obtained from the set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by the trace of D by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations (Nielsen transformations and conjugations).

Proof. Let $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ be the set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by the trace of D and $B = \{b_1, \cdots, b_n\}$ the trace of D'. Suppose that $D = \{d_1, \cdots, d_n\}$ and D' is obtained from D by replacing d_1 in D by d_1'. So $D' = \{d_1', d_2, \cdots, d_n\}$ and d_1' separates exactly two of the pairs $d_i^{\pm}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, in U_D and moreover there are only two of the $d_i^{\pm}$'s, one from the pair $d_1^{\pm}$ and the other from other pairs, in one of the two parts of $(U_D)_{d_1'}$. Without loss of generality, assume that the other one of the $d_i^{\pm}$'s is from the pair $d_2^{\pm}$. So $\partial d'$ is a simple closed curve obtained by sliding ∂d_2 over ∂d_1 along a suitable simple curve on $\partial U = \partial V$ connecting ∂d_1 and ∂d_2. Then any element of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by $\partial d'$ is a conjugate of $a_1^{\epsilon_1} g a_2^{\epsilon_2} g^{-1}$, where g is an element of $\pi_1(V,p)$ depending on the curve used in sliding and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 = 1$ or -1 depending on the orientation of ∂d_1, ∂d_2 and $\partial d_1'$. In particular b_1 is a conjugate of $a_1^{\epsilon_1} g a_2^{\epsilon_2} g^{-1}$. Consequently $\{b_1, \cdots, b_n\}$ is conjugate to $\{a_1^{\epsilon_1} g a_2^{\epsilon_2} g^{-1}, a_2, \cdots, a_n\}$. Lemma 3.1 then follows.

Theorem 3.2. *If (R,V) is a Heegaard diagram for S^3 and $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ is a set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$. Then $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ can be transformed into a set of free generators of the free group $\pi_1(V,p)$ by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations .*

Proof. By the discussion preceding Lemma 3.1, R is the trace of a section D_R of $U = cl(S^3 - V)$. By Theorem 2.2, D_R can be transformed into the section D_C by a finite number of elementary replacements. It then follows from Lemma 4.1 that the set of elements $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ represented by R can be transformed into the set of elements of F represented by C by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations. The set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by C is, up to conjugation, a set of free generators of $\pi_1(V,p)$. Thus $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ can be transformed into a set of free generators of $\pi_1(V,p)$ by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Note that Theorem 3.2 does include some non-trivial case. By trivial case we mean the case in which the set of elements of $\pi_1(V,p)$ represented by R is conjugate to a free basis. The trivial case is precisely the case when the diagram (R,V) is equivalent to the canonical diagram (C,V). There are diagrams for S^3 that are not equivalent to (C,V).

Also note that in [7], Rolfsen states that

Theorem: *The AC conjecture is true for spines.*

What Rolfsen calls "the AC conjecture" here is a geometric version of the Andrews-Curtis conjecture. It asserts that any contractible 2-complex 3-deforms to a point. Thus the above theorem says that any contractible spine 3-deforms to a point. It is not hard to see that a Heegaard diagram for S^3 corresponds to a contractible spine.

Therefore the condition in the above theorem is basically the same as in Theorem 3.2. It is however well known ([11]) that this geometric version of AC conjecture is equivalent to what is actually referred to by many as "weak Andrews-Curtis conjecture" (see [5], for example). It requires an additional operation, namely the addition (and deletion) of a new generator and a new relator that is equal to the new generator. Thus Theorem 3.2 is stronger than the theorem above. And our proof is quite different from the simple-homotopy theoretic arguments sketched by Rolfsen.

Since the Poincare conjecture is true, as is now widely believed after Perelman's work, we have

Corollary 3.3. *If (R, V) is a Heegaard diagram for a homotopy 3-sphere and $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ is a set of elements of $\pi_1(V, p)$ represented by $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$. Then $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ can be transformed into a set of free generators of the free group $\pi_1(V, p)$ by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations.*

It is perhaps also of interest to see the implication of Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 in pure algebraic terms. In the rest of this note, we give an algebraic equivalence of a Heegaard diagram as defined in this note, and then describe Corollary 3.3 in pure algebraic terms.

Let F be a free group of rank n. A set $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_k\}$ of k elements of F is said to be conjugate to another set $B = \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\}$ of k elements of F if for each $i = 1, \cdots, k$, a_i is conjugate to b_i. A set $\{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ of n elements of F is said to be **complete** or **a complete set** if it is conjugate to a set $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ for which there is a set $\{b_1, \cdots, b_n\}$ of elements of F such that $F = (a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_n, b_n)$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{n}[a_i, b_i] = 1$.

We will now see that a complete set of F is just the algebraic equivalent of a complete system on the boundary of a handlebody of genus n, that is, a Heegaard diagram. Jaco [4] proved that every so-called splitting homomorphism is equivalent to a splitting homomorphism induced by a Heegaard splitting of a closed 3-manifold. This is used to prove the following

Lemma 3.4. *Let F be a free group of rank n. A set $\{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ of n elements of F is a complete set if and only if there is an isomorphism α from F to $\pi_1(V, p)$ where V is a handlebody and p is a point on ∂V such that $\{\alpha(c_1), \cdots, \alpha(c_n)\}$ is represented by a complete system on ∂V.*

Proof. The "if" part is straight forward. Without loss of generality, assume that $F = \pi_1(V, p)$ for some handlebody V of genus n with a base point p on ∂V and $\{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ is represented by a complete system $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$ on ∂V. Choose a complete system $\tilde{R} = \{\tilde{r}_1, \cdots, \tilde{r}_n\}$ on ∂V such that $r_i \cap \tilde{r}_j$ is exactly one point if $i = j$ and empty if $i \neq j$. Then $\pi_1(\partial V, p) = (A_1, B_1, \cdots, A_n, B_n \mid \prod_i [A_i, B_i])$ where $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ are elements of $\pi_1(\partial V, p)$ determined respectively by $r_1, \cdots, r_n$ with some connecting curves from p and $B_1, \cdots, B_n$ by $\tilde{r}_1, \cdots, \tilde{r}_n$. Let $a_i = i_{V*}(A_i)$ and $b_i = i_{V*}(B_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, where i_{V*} is the map induced by the inclusion $i_V : \partial V \to V$. Then $F = \pi_1(V, p) = (a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_n, b_n)$ and $\prod_i [a_i, b_i] = 1$. Clearly $\{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ is

conjugate to $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$. This shows the "if" part.

Now we show the "only if" part. By the assumption, there are sets $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ and $\{b_1, \cdots, b_n\}$ of elements of F such that $F = (a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_n, b_n)$, $\prod_i [a_i, b_i] = 1$ and $\{c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ is conjugate to $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$. It suffices to show that there is an isomorphism α from F to $\pi_1(V, p)$ where V is a handlebody and p is a point on ∂V such that $\{\alpha(a_1), \cdots, \alpha(a_n)\}$ is represented by a complete system on ∂V.

Let (S, p) be a closed surface of genus n with base point p, and $\{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$ and $\{\tilde{r}_1, \cdots, \tilde{r}_n\}$ be two complete systems on S away from p such that $r_i \cap \tilde{r}_j$ is exactly one point if $i = j$ and empty if $i \neq j$. Let $A_1, \cdots, A_n$ be elements of $\pi_1(S, p)$ determined respectively by $r_1, \cdots, r_n$ with some connecting curves from p and $B_1, \cdots, B_n$ be elements determined by $\tilde{r}_1, \cdots, \tilde{r}_n$. We may choose the connecting curves so that $\pi_1(S, p) = (A_1, B_1 \cdots, A_n, B_n \mid \prod_i [A_i, B_i])$. Now let $G = (A_1, B_1, \cdots, A_n, B_n)$ be a free group of rank $2n$ freely generated by the symbols $A_1, B_1, \cdots, A_n, B_n$ and $F_1 = (y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ be a free group of rank n freely generated by the symbols $y_1, \cdots, y_n$. Note that here we use each of the A_i's and B_i's to denote two things: the element of $\pi_1(S, p)$ determined by one of the curves r_i and $\tilde{r}_i$ with some connecting curve, and a generating symbol for the free group G. It should be clear what is meant from the context.

Let$\mathcal{P}$ be the projection map from G to $\pi_1(S, p)$, $\mathcal{P}(A_i) = A_i$, $\mathcal{P}(B_i) = B_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Define maps $\phi_1 : G \to F_1$ and $\phi : G \to F$ by $\phi_1(A_i) = 1, \phi_1(B_i) = y_i$, and $\phi(A_i) = a_i, \phi(B_i) = b_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Both ϕ_1 and ϕ are surjective. Since $\phi_1(\prod_{i=1,\cdots,n}[A_i, B_i]) = \phi(\prod_{i=1,\cdots,n}[A_i, B_i]) = 1$, ϕ_1 and ϕ both factor through the fundamental group $\pi_1(S, p)$. So there are maps $\psi_1 : \pi_1(S, p) \to F_1$ and $\psi : \pi_1(S, p) \to F$ such that $\phi_1 = \psi_1 \circ \mathcal{P}$ and $\phi = \psi \circ \mathcal{P}$. Clearly ψ_1 and ψ are also surjective. Thus $\Psi = (\psi_1, \psi) : \pi_1(S, p) \to F_1 \times F$ is a so-called splitting homomorphism (see [4]). By a theorem of Jaco [4], the map $\Psi = (\psi_1, \psi) : \pi_1(S, p) \to F_1 \times F$ is equivalent to a splitting homomorphism $(i_{U*}, i_{V*}) : \pi_1(T = U \cap V, q) \to \pi_1(U, q) \times \pi_1(V, q)$ induced by a Heegaard splitting (U, V) of some closed 3-manifold M, where q is some point on $T = U \cap V$. This means that there are isomorphisms $\mu : \pi_1(S, p) \to \pi_1(T, q)$, $\alpha_1 : F_1 \to \pi_1(U, q)$ and $\alpha : F \to \pi_1(V, q)$ such that $\alpha_1 \circ \psi_1 = i_{U*} \circ \mu$ and $\alpha \circ \psi = i_{V*} \circ \mu$. By composing μ with an inner automorphism of $\pi_1(T, q)$, and η_1 and η with the corresponding inner automorphisms of $\pi_1(U, q)$ and $\pi_1(V, q)$ respectively if necessary, we can assume that μ is induced by a homeomorphism $h : (S, p) \to (T, q)$. Then $\alpha(a_1), \cdots, \alpha(a_n)$ are elements of $\pi_1(V, q)$ determined respectively by the simple closed curves $h(r_1), \cdots, h(r_n)$ on $T = \partial V$ with some connecting curves. That is, α is an isomorphism from F to $\pi_1(V, p)$ such that $\{\alpha(a_1), \cdots, \alpha(a_n)\}$ is represented by the complete system $\{h(r_1), \cdots, h(r_n)\}$ on ∂V. This completes the proof of the "only if" part of Lemma 3.4 hence also that of Lemma 3.4.

In practice, it seems not easy to determine whether or not a given set of n elements of F is complete. We are most interested in sets that generate F normally. Following [2], we will call a set $A = \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ of n elements of F **an annihilating n-tuple** if $F = \langle a_1, \cdots, a_n \rangle$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let F be a free group of rank n and $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ be an annihilating n-tuple for F. If $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ is complete, then (assuming that the Poincare conjecture is true) $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ can be transformed into any free basis of F by a finite number of Andrews-Curtis transformations.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$ is complete. By Lemma 3.4, there is an isomorphism $\alpha : F \mapsto \pi_1(V, p)$ where V is a handlebody of genus n and p is a point on ∂V such that $\{\alpha(a_1), \cdots, \alpha(a_n)\}$ is represented by a complete system $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$ on ∂V. Using α we identify F with $\pi_1(V, p)$ and $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ with elements of $\pi_1(V, p)$ represented respectively by $r_1, \cdots, r_n$.

Consider the Heegaard diagram (R, V) where $R = \{r_1, \cdots, r_n\}$. Since $\pi_1(V, p) = F = \langle a_1, \cdots, a_n \rangle$, the manifold M determined by (R, V) is simply connected. Theorem 3.5 then follows from Corollary 3.3.

References

[1] J. J. Andrews and M. L. Curtis, Free Groups and Handlebodies, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 16(1965), 192-195.

[2] R. Burns and O. Macedonska, Balanced Presentations of the Trivial Group, Bull. London Math. Soc. 25 (1993), 513-526.

[3] J. Hempel, 3-Manifolds, Ann. Math. Studies 86, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1976.

[4] W. Jaco, Heegaard Splittings and Splitting Homomorphisms, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 144 (1969), 365-379.

[5] A. D. Myasnikov, A. G. Myasnikov and V. Shpilrain, On the Andrews-Curtis Equivalence, Contemp. Math., Amer. Math. Soc. 296 (2002), 183-198.

[6] C. D. Papakyriakopoulos, A reduction of the Poincare conjecture to group theoretic conjectures, Ann. Math. 77(1963), 250-305.

[7] D. Rolfsen, The Poincare conjecture and its cousins, a survey note circulating on the internet.

[8] C. Rourke, Heegaard Diagrams and Homotopy 3-Speres, Topology, vol. 27, No. 2, 1988, 137-143.

[9] B. Wajnryb, Mapping class group of a handlebody, FUNDAMENTA MATHEMATICAE, 158(1998), 195-228.

[10] F. Waldhausen, Heegaard-Zerlegungen der 3-Sphare, Topology 7 (1968), 195-203.

[11] P. Wright, Group Presentations and Formal Deformations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 208(1975), 161-169.

[12] H. Zieschang, On Simple Systems of Paths on Complete Pretzels, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., (2), vol. 92, 1970.

Beijing, China

E-mail: guoguangyuan@yahoo.com